

REMARKS

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20-23, and 25 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. Claims 4, 9, 14, 19, and 24 are canceled.

The specification was objected to because the title was not descriptive and the Abstract was not long enough(?) In response, Applicant has amended the title and the Abstract. Accordingly, Applicants believe these objections have been overcome.

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosner et al. (U.S. Patent 6,636,968) in view of Schneier (article "Applied Cryptography"). However, the present claims recite: "generating on the basis of said encryption key, sets of passkeys by dividing said encryption key by a division pattern unique to each of said specific destinations." (Claim 2; all claims contain similar limitations) When the present invention generates passkeys, an encryption key is divided by a division pattern which is different for each destination.

(Specification page 31, lines 15-18; page 39, lines 18-21). Applicants assert that neither Rosner nor Schneier discloses an analogous teaching to the unique division patterns required in the present invention. Accordingly, Rosner and Schneier fail to meet this division pattern limitation and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

An extension of time fee is deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment. No additional fees are anticipated, but if such are required, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 

Darren M. Simon
Reg. No. 47,946
(212) 588-0800